

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1 and 2 were pending and all of the claims were rejected in the Office action. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. No new matter was added as a result of this amendment.

Rejection of Claims

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ota et al. (US 6,404,508; "Ota"). The rejections are respectfully traversed. The claims have nevertheless been amended to further define the invention and to eliminate any lack of clarity that may have been the basis for the rejections.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first screen angle to be used for primary color recording is first determined and the first gradation pattern image is recorded, and then a second screen angle to be used for recording secondary color recording is determined based on the first screen angle and the second gradation pattern image is recorded based on the second screen angle.

Ota does not teach or suggest this limitation of the arrangement of amended Claim 1.

Ota is directed towards a method of color printing where each of a color pair is printed using a different color pattern, each color pattern consisting of two different superimposed patterns, such that the individual color is represented by both a line shape and a lump shape. The size of the picture element represented in the color first grows in, for example, the lump shape, and then grows in the line shape (col. 5, lines 48-58). Two colors, having suitable sets of patterns may then be overlapped even though they have the same screen. Additionally, the screen angles assigned to each color are predetermined. Alternatively, a lump mode pattern may be assigned to a first color and a line shape pattern assigned to a second color, again so that two colors may be printed at the same screen angle, and the overlap of the two colors will be independent of misalignment in a least one of the dimensions. (col. 6, line 47 to col. 7, line 23). In contrast, the arrangement of Claim 1 results in a first screen

angle being determined for the primary color, and a second screen angle being determined for the secondary color, and the screen angles are therefore different from each other. The Examiner suggests that "wherein two colors, namely a primary colorand a secondary color....are selected from among a plurality of color inks.... a first screen angle to be used for the primary color....and a second screen angle for....the secondary screen color....is determined based on the first screen angle...." (Office action, Item 3). The Applicants respectfully submit these limitations are not found literally or as concepts in the cited portions of the reference, and respectfully invite the Examiner to identify the specific aspect of the reference that is asserted to be relevant. The Applicants respectfully submit that Ota does not teach or suggest the arrangement of amended Claim 1 and, for at least these reasons, the claim is not anticipated.

Claim 2 is dependent on allowable Claim 1, and is allowable, without more.


Conclusion

Claims 1 and 2 were pending; Claims 1 and 2 were amended. Claims 1-2 remain pending.

For at least the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks an early allowance thereof.

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200